Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicant requests a two month extension of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), in which to respond to the Office Action of November 27, 2007. Payment of the requisite fee, in respect of a small entity, is included with this submission.

Amendments

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 7, and 9 currently stand of record in the present application. All claims currently stand rejected.

In response to the Office Action, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 5 and 6, and two paragraphs of the specification, to indicate that the stored content is stored in a separate data structure from the original document storage location. Basis for these amendments can be found in the text of the application as originally filed, and in particular, on line 4 of the Abstract wherein it is clearly stated that the documents of interest are stored "in a separate data structure". As such, no additional subject matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

Remarks

The Applicant notes that the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, with respect to Claims 2 to 9, and the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 USC 101, have now both been withdrawn. However, the rejections of Claims 1 to 3, and 5 to 7 , under 35 USC 102(b) have been maintained. Further, Claim 9 now stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as bing obvious over the cited prior art.

In response to these objections, the Applicant provides the following comments.

Claim Objections

The Applicant apologizes for any errors in the manner of amendment of the previously submitted claims. The Examiner's interpretation of the previously submitted claims as stated in the Action, is correct. The current set of amended claims are correctly presented.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The present invention provides a simple method for a user to identify and save actual copies of any computer displayable documents and/or other information that the user deems to be a relevant document, to a user defined, separate storage system. A key feature of the present invention is that a copy of the actual highlighted information that the user wishes to save, is always saved to the user defined database. This excludes the approach of merely saving bookmarks, URL's, tags, metadata, or any other shorthand method to return to the original document cite. This is an important point since it ensures that the user can always retrieve the exact information that was first found. In a situation where a web page, or some other document has been amended, updated, or even removed, the user still has the capability of searching, retrieving and viewing the exact document as first observed and saved.

Further, while the saved document can be updated, if desired, there is still the option to view a copy of the original document since a copy of that exact document has been saved. This is much improved over the system of merely saving bookmarks, tags, or the like, since these approaches are reliant on the original content remaining unchanged in order to ensure that the proper relevant information is retrieved.

The document saved can be any of a variety of document types, such as web page images, word processing documents, spreadsheets, and the like. However, in all cases, an exact copy of the relevant information of interest to the user, is stored in the user defined database, and thus is always observable.

A second key feature is that the user defined database is, by definition, always under the control of the user since it is the user's defined database. This means that only the user would normally be able to delete the content. This is preferably done by ensuring that the data is stored in a user defined storage location separate from the original source. Preferably, the separate storage location is a storage location which is separate from the original data. For example, a web page from the Internet, could be downloaded and saved on, for example, the user's computer, a local device connected to the user's computer, a remote device such as a local server, a network device such as a storage device for a local network, an Internet storage device, or the like. However, it could also include an

Internet-based storage device different from the original web page, or a storage device or system provided by an Application Service Provider, or the like. The key feature is that the storage system is a user defined (and thus, user controlled), database.

Essential features of the present claims, are that a copy of the relevant document is stored in a separate, user defined database (on any suitable storage device), and that it is stored in such a manner such that the user has access to a copy of the original document.

In order to achieve this, the Applicant provides a simple, convenient approach to saving relevant documents of interest to a user, in a separate, searchable database. The claims have been amended to clearly provide for this capability.

In view of these amendments, the Applicant notes that Claims 1 to 3 and 5 to 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2002/0069218 (hereinafter "Sull"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the amendments made herein.

Sull provides a wide ranging document which describes a number of different features. In overview, though, Sull provides various methods for retrieving multimedia information from the original source. Sull does not, however, store a copy of the relevant document in a separate, searchable, user-defined database.

In more detail, as to the Examiner's specific comments on Claim 1, it is first noted that the Examiner comments that Sull stores the relevant document in a user defined data structure which the Examiner considers to include the phrase "tag or bookmark". However, Claim 1 requires that the relevant document (and by this is meant a complete copy of the relevant document rather than just a tag or bookmarked position) be saved to a separate data structure. Consequently, saving a tag or bookmarked position is not the same as the present invention wherein a copy of the relevant document is saved.

This approach clearly has benefits over the Sull approach. The major disadvantage of Sull's approach of using tags or bookmarked positions is that if a tagged or bookmarked document has been modified or removed, the user will not be able to access the original, relevant information. As such, Sull's approach of saving tags or

bookmarked position information does not provide the same features as the present invention.

Sull acknowledges the disadvantages of saving only a bookmarked favorite in, for example, paragraphs 0007 to 0010 of his published application. In his case, though, he wishes to overcome these problems, as applied to viewing a multimedia file, and provide a method of accessing a multimedia file at a selected location (rather than having to start viewing the entire file over again each time the file is accessed). Sull relies on the original multimedia file to remain available, however, and preferably to remain intact. As such, his primary focus is to provide a method for accessing the multimedia file at a specific location.

The Examiner points to Figure 2, and paragraph 0172 of Sull, to show a marking device, but the Applicant contends that Figure 2 and paragraph 0172 merely describe the storage of bookmark positions. While these may be marking devices, they do not result in the separate storage of the original, relevant document. A bookmarked location is simply not the same as providing a separately stored copy of the original information.

The Examiner also refers to paragraph 0376 as a method to determine if a document is relevant. However, the Applicant contends that this paragraph merely provides that Sull can prepare a listing of perceptually relevant images or "PRI's". Again though, this listing is merely a listing of bookmarked or tagged locations, and not a separate storage of the original file itself. Further, it does not necessarily mean that the PRI would be in agreement with the user's preference with respect to relevant documents.

The Examiner also points to Figure 12, and paragraph 0211 which describe how the Sull system determines where to start playback of the multimedia file by storage of the bookmarks or tags related to that file. However, this is not relevant to the present invention. In fact, in paragraph 0211, Sull is describing how to begin playback in a situation where the multimedia file has changed. This is clearly not relevant to the present invention, since the present invention requires storage of a copy of the original file (i.e. document) in a separate data structure.

The Examiner next refers to Figure 33 in respect of having a database of stored

documents, but the Applicant contends that this figure provides a method for creating a new file, from existing files, as described in paragraph 0467 and the production of a virtually <u>edited</u> metafile. Thus, Sull still does not provide for storage of the <u>original</u> file (i.e. a copy of the relevant document).

The Examiner also points to Figure 18 in respect of providing storage of documents on a storage device. However, Figure 18 is directed to a SMS system wherein the bookmarks and tags are transferred to a PDA or the like as explained in paragraph 0269 *et seq.* This has no relevance to the present invention. The storage systems shown in Figure 18 are not directed to separate storage of copied information, but are merely the storage locations of the original information. There is no indication that these are stored copies in a user defined database structure that can be searched by the user.

The Examiner further points to Figure 15 and paragraph 0053 and 0214 in respect of providing a search of the relevant documents. In fact, these references merely show that a search of the multimedia <u>bookmarks</u> can be conducted based on audio-visual features and text files save in the bookmarks. It is not a search of the content of the stored copies of the original documents, which have been stored in the separate data structure.

Next, the Examiner points to paragraph 518, Figures 43-44 and Claim 72 for the aspect of comparing the stored document with an updated copy of the stored document. However, these reference points are related to providing adequate viewing content on different sized viewing devices, and are not an attempt to determine if updated data is available. The concept of switching screen sizes and video content value is irrelevant in the present application. However, even if Sull determines that updated multimedia files are available, he does not provide a mechanism to still be able to view the older file content. He merely tries to determine where to begin playback on the newer file (See paragraph 0194 for example).

The Examiner again points to Fig. 2, and paragraph 0172 in respect of Sull providing a selection device. As previously stated, though, these sections of Sull relate to the storage of bookmark information, and not to the storage or selection of relevant materials from a stored copy of the original document.

The Examiner also cites paragraphs 0051 to 0053 in respect of identifying

documents that have the desired search content. These paragraphs, however, are again related to multimedia <u>bookmarks</u>, and again, the Applicant notes that it is exactly this type of information that Applicant seeks to avoid. It is also irrelevant which storage system Sull uses for storage of the mulitmedia bookmarks or other multimedia information. He simply does not provide for separate storage of a copy of the original document, and for search and identification of relevant content from the stored copies

Paragraphs 0301 and 0313 are cited in respect of displaying the original copy or an updated copy, and the Examiner indicates that he interprets this to include "refresh frames". Sull uses refresh frames - in a storyboard or slide show format - to display information from a multimedia file that has been interrupted and then re-started. There is no attempt to determine whether an updated file exists, or the like. Therefore, the refresh frames are merely portions of the original file displayed to proceed the re-started multimedia file. They are not an attempt to determine whether a new file exists, and thus show either the update filed or the stored file.

Finally, the Examiner refers to the terms "query", "search" and "play" in Figures 6, 3 and 2 in respect of displaying the selected document. These terms are clearly directed towards the multimedia file application described by Sull, and thus, have little if anything to do with the present invention.

In summary therefore, Sull is related to a method to view multimedia files, while providing a method to resume playback of the file from a desired location. It has nothing to do with storage of copies of user-defined, relevant documents in a separate data structure, which separate database can be later searched by the user to locate an exact copy of the relevant document, or alternatively, an updated copy of the document (when desired and when one exists). As such, the Applicant contends that the Sull document cannot anticipate the present invention, and therefore, the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) should now be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 2, it is acknowledged that this claim is directed to known computerized devices. However, since this claim is dependent on allowable Claim 1, it is therefore also allowable.

With respect to Claim 3, it is again noted that the document types listed in the claim are all known to the skilled artisan. However, again, since the claim is dependent on Claim 1, it is therefore also allowable.

As to Claim 5, the Examiner refers to Figures 18 and 19, and also refers to paragraphs 172, 173 and 321. Figures 18 and 19 are addressing a situation wherein a bookmark for video content from a web page is provided from a user's PC to a user's mobile phone or PDA. This is clearly explained in paragraphs 269 to 276. At all times though, Sull discusses merely sending a stored bookmark to a user's PDA etc., and does not imply or suggest that the original file content is stored in a user database. While a video storage device (1812) is shown in Figure 18, there is no reference to this device in the disclosure of Sull, and there is nothing to suggest that anything other than video bookmarks are stored. As such, it does not anticipate the present invention. While the storage of a URL (or bookmark) can be taken from the Sull disclosure, there is nothing to suggest that the document itself is stored in a fashion that the stored document, in its original form, is located in a searchable database.

Further, however, it is noted that Claim 5 is dependent on allowable Claim 1, and therefore is also allowable.

As to Claim 6, the Applicant notes that Sull saves his information on similar devices to those described with respect to Claim 6. However, again, Sull is not saving a copy of the original information, but is merely saving references such as bookmarks, and the like, to the specific items of interest to the user. Thus, the fundamental difference in approach again differentiates the present invention from Sull. Again, it can be noted that if the original content was removed from the Sull system, accessing the original information would not be possible.

As to Claim 7, the Applicant notes that Sull's system is useable and searchable with respect to similar information sources, such as those found in the present invention, and listed in Claim 7. However, since Claim 7 is dependent on allowable Claim 1, it is

also allowable.

Consequently, in view of the comments made hereinabove, the Applicant contends that Sull merely provides a method for storage and handling of multimedia bookmarks, tags, and the like, and provides a method to access the multimedia files and information in a manner that is more useful to the user. However, he does not disclose or teach the aspects of the present invention, namely, storage of a copy of a relevant document in a user defined database, and providing the ability to search the user defined database to access the relevant documents (regardless of whether the original source of the relevant document is still available to the user). As such, Sull cannot anticipate the present invention, and therefore the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Sull in view of US Patent 6931597 (hereinafter Prakash), published on August 16, 2005.

It is noted that Prakash was published after the date of entry into the National Phase of the US application, and certainly was therefore published after the filing date of the parent PCT application. As such, the Prakash document was not available to the public as of either the filing date of the PCT application, or the date of National Phase entry into the United States. As such, it is not citable under 35 USC 103(a). However, even if citable, it is noted that Prakash is cited only to show that permission based authorization system are known in the art. Even if this is the case, it is noted that amended Claim 9 is dependent on allowable Claim 1, and therefore, Claim 9 is also allowable.

As such, the Applicant contends that the rejection of Claim 9, under 35 USC 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

Summary

The Applicant contends that the rejections under 35 USC 102 have been obviated or rendered moot, by the amendments presented herein, or in view of the comments presented herein. Sull clearly does not provide a system wherein a copy of an original, user-relevant document is stored on a separate, user-defined database which is searchable for locating original copies of any desired content. Thus, Sull does not anticipate the present invention.

As such, the Applicant contends that the rejections of Claims 1 to 3, and 5 to 7, under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

The Applicant also contends that the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 USC 103 is not a valid rejection of the claim. Even if valid, however, the Applicant notes that Claim 9 is dependent on allowable Claim 1, and therefore, is also allowable.

The Applicant also contends that all of the amendments presented herein are fairly based on the application as originally filed, and thus do not introduce any additional subject matter.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully contends that the present application as amended is in an allowable condition, and respectfully solicits a Notice of Allowance at the earliest opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,
Gowan Intellectual Property

Gowan Intellectual Property
1075 North Service Road West
Suite # 203
Oakville, Ontario
CANADA L6M 2G2
T: 905-827-5000
F.   905-827-5087

Per: **Gerald A. Gowan**
Registered Patent & Trade-Mark Agent
US Registration No. 37,041/US Client No. 58388
email: ggowan@gowanip.com

GAG:tim
encls.